

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application based on the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Support for the amendments may be found throughout the specification. No new matter has been added as a consequence of these amendments.

Claims 23-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0153787 ("Carpenter") in view of U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0187103 ("Bloom"). Claims 35-41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Carpenter in view of Bloom and in further view of U.S. Patent 6,780,910 ("Bouvy"). For at least the following reasons and the above detailed amendment to the claims, the claims are believed to be patentable over the cited references.

The arguments presented in the previous Response dated April 22, 2011 are hereby incorporated, in their entirety, herein. Specifically noted is the argument that none of the cited references teach or suggest compounds having on average at least 1.2 groups/compound that are, or comprise, a hydrocarbyl group comprising at least two ethylenic double bonds.

Further, it is submitted that the combination of references provide only general guidance of the types of materials without an suggestions or motivation to select particular components from these differing areas of art – nor any basis as to why any such combination (had it been suggested) would be successful. It is submitted that the *prima facie* rejections of obviousness asserted in the outstanding Office Action should be withdrawn as it amounts to nothing more than an Obvious to Try assertion.

Furthermore, the combination of references does not even get to the optimization issue as the combination of references do not suggest combining the polyunsaturated fatty acid, or derivative thereof, from Bloom with the compounds of Carpenter. While Bloom is from the "same field of endeavor" as the present application, the test, however, is whether it is in the same field of endeavor as the primary reference - and it is not. Accordingly, the present claims, as amended, stand in condition for allowance over the presently cited art as the combination of the art does not (i) render the claimed invention obvious nor obvious to try. And, of course,


the claimed invention is not a mere optimization of something that was never even suggested.

Therefore, all objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney for Applicants at the telephone number indicated below in order to expeditiously resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

JONES DAY

By: 
Paul L. Sharer
Registration No. 36,004
Direct No. (202) 879-5481

Intellectual Property Group
51 Louisiana Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001-2113
(202) 879-3939 Telephone
(202) 626-1700 Facsimile

Date: December 7, 2011